Congress Dislikes the Bill of Rights, P. 4

On Nuclear Weapons Training (and Israeli Arms) for the Germans, See Pages 2 and 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 27 JULY 13, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

What Could Be More Refreshing Than A Pentagon Fire?

That fire over at the Pentagon filled us with refreshing thoughts. Millions of people everywhere would breathe more easily if one wonderful day fire destroyed the military headquarters of the U. S. and the U. S. S. R., including the mechanical brains into which we and our children are fed as data. It might take years to duplicate the computations, to redraw the war maps, to prepare new secret plans. In the meantime we could go fishing nearby in the Potomac and our friend Ivan in the Dnieper without having to worry about the horrors tensely leashed to protect us. The wacky fallacies of mutual deterrence come to the surface when a fire at the Pentagon reminds us how the world would feel if suddenly the deterrents went up in mutual smoke. Our planet would be like one of those frontier towns when one day a Sheriff arrived and made everybody put away the six-shooters with which they had been deterring each other. In the blessed silence which followed, people learned to walk without being jumpy, secure at last in the knowledge that any sudden shot could only be an automobile backfiring or a fire-cracker left over from the Fourth of July.

Helpful Hints for Geneva Negotiators

As the Berlin talks resume in Geneva, our negotiators may be helped by the strange blueprints worked out by the Pentagon's pet scientists on the mechanics of limiting a nuclear war. They start with the premise that all-out nuclear war should be avoided because it would be mutual suicide. They move on to the proposition that war can only be limited if the enemy is asked for less than unconditional surrender. They conclude that nuclear war must be waged for aims so reasonable that the enemy will prefer to settle rather than fight on to extermination. Thus Henry A. Kissinger in his *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* says (p. 169) we "must pay special attention to the importance of diplomatic overtures which make clear [i.e. to the enemy] that national survival is not at stake and that a settlement is possible on reasonable terms. Otherwise the result is almost certain to be either stalemate or all-out war." There was testimony in a similar vein by Dr. Robert R. Newell of the U. S. Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory—the scientist we quoted last week who thinks a nuclear war might improve the human race.

The problem, as disclosed before the recent nuclear war hearings by Dr. Newell, is how to keep the war limited enough so some people will survive. "If and when we actually engage in combat," Dr. Newell advised, "we must push the adversary only a limited amount. We must not push the war so fast as to frighten him into the thought that he might lose it. We must give him time to make intelligent decisions. We must go after very limited objectives. We must accept a small surrender—maybe merely the abandonment of a single activity that we find intolerable. The objective must be limited. . . ." Dr. Newell admitted this would constitute a "revolution in diplomacy and an emergent ideal of national purpose to plan cooperatively with our enemy to regain the peace." This is indeed a new tune.

What puzzles us, as an ignorant layman, is this. If we're going to be so diplomatic and ready to compromise after umteen million of our people and theirs have been killed in a nuclear attack, why not try some of that conciliatory tactic *before* part of our population is dead and part of our cities in ruin? Why be so intransigeant at the conference table if we are prepared to be so reasonable after war has begun? Even a teensy-weensy nuclear war would leave little left on either side of the line in divided Berlin, and a really hearty nuclear salvo might be the end of Germany. What would we do then? Offer to call off the war on condition that Berlin be made a free city radioactively off limits to both sides?

Footnote on Some Breathless Journalism

"The inner circle of the American Government has been shaken and alarmed by a Hitler-like interview given to W. Averell Harriman by Nikita S. Krushchev. The crude threats that the Soviet leader indulged in, the brutal tone and the unprintable language that he employed, are considered to mark a new phase in the world situation."

—Joseph Alsop's column, July 2

"But Mr. Harriman, talking to The Star from Bonn in West Germany, denied the 'rough talk' story categorically. The report, he observed, 'sounds like a botched-up leak from the State Department. It seems like anything you say to the State Department comes out the other end like sausage meat.'"

—Washington Sunday Star Review of the Week July 5

If Only the Negro Problem Were in Irkutsk

Our leadership, so morally intransigeant abroad, continues to be tepid at home. Mr. Eisenhower was taken aback when a reporter ventured to ask whether he thought segregation morally wrong. He fumbled into a queasy statement so equivocal his Southern bridge-playing friends may easily equate it with the racist doctrine that segregation is only wrong when the Negro is not given equal though separate facilities. Segregation as a system of humiliation designed to make the colored child feel a nigger (only the brutal word matches the brutal fact) from his first days in school is beyond the President's ken. If only the Negro problem were in Irkutsk, the CIA would be briefing him on it every morning, and Air Force Generals would sound like the NAACP.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No Voice in Senate and Few in Country Question A-Weapons for Germans

Seven Maverick Democratic Congressmen Challenge Nuclear Give-Away

A little band of seven Congressmen have introduced resolutions to block the spread of nuclear training and arms. All are Democrats and four are freshmen. These four are William H. Meyer of Vermont; Byron Johnson of Colorado; Leonard G. Wolf of Iowa; and Clement Woodnut Miller of Marin County, California. They have been joined by three older members: Roy Wier of Minnesota, in Congress since 1948; Edith S. Green of Oregon, first elected in 1954; and second-termer George S. McGovern of South Dakota.

Mrs. Green favors sharing atomic information only with Britain and Canada, and Miller only with Britain, but have joined the other five in introducing resolutions to veto the pending NATO nuclear arms agreements with France, Germany, Holland, Greece and Turkey. The other five are sponsoring bills to veto the proposed British and Canadian agreements as well.

A Pacifist and A War Hero

The seven mavericks bold enough to question bipartisan acquiescence in predigested military decisions range from Colorado's Johnson, a member of the Pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation, to Dakota's McGovern who flew 35 combat missions as the pilot of a B-24 in the European Theatre, and holds the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters.

The pending agreements automatically go into effect within 60 days of their submission unless during that time both houses of Congress pass a concurrent resolution vetoing them. The deadline on the British and French agreements is July 18; on the Canadian, German, Dutch and Turkish, July 25; and on the Greek, August 10. A blanket of silence has covered the agreements. Senator Pastore announced on June 23 that public hearings would be held July 1 and 2 but few newspapers published this announcement. One day of the public hearings was taken up with routine presentations by State and Defense (they had already appeared in executive session before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy). By the time "the public" was heard on July 2, only 16 days were left before the British and French treaty deadlines and only 23 days on the Canadian, German, Dutch and Turkish. If there is no public pressure, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy can easily bottle up the veto resolutions until it is too late for passage. Holifield, who raised the alarm on this question last year, has gone over to the AEC point of view. Senator Anderson, who last year fought the amendments authorizing these agreements, has yet to speak up this year. Humphrey, Mansfield and Fulbright, all enlightened on the German question, are also silent.

The silence is appalling. At the July 2 hearing, no voice spoke up from the labor movement. No churches were heard in protest except the Quakers. Though this means nuclear arms for the Germans, the only Jewish representative who turned up was Rabbi Isidor Hoffman, who heads a tiny group called the Jewish Peace Fellowship. There was a message of protest from Norman Thomas, a moving statement by Mrs. Josephine Pomerance of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, an eloquent declaration by Donald Keys of the National Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy, an illuminating presentation by the Federation of American Scientists (see page 3) and a statement by William Price of the United Independent-Socialist Committee of New York. Congressman Meyer testified. Never did testimony on so high a level meet with such obvious indifference from a rump subcomittee. Unless Senators hear from home quickly a fateful move in foreign and military policy will be taken without debate in Congress. These lines are written in despair.

Not Isaiah's Vision

Not the least painful aspect of the Israeli-German arms deal is that it was exposed by a German weekly, Der Spiegel, which is friendly to Israel and has been vigilant in exposing neo-Nazi influences within the Bonn government and in combatting anti-Semitism.

The German and Jewish peoples must be reconciled, for humanity if it is to survive must become one family. Not to trade would be unfriendly but to trade in arms is to betray the best elements of both peoples and to shame the memory of the martyred. Ben Gurion may live to regret his complacency.

Those of us who were in on the struggles which led to the birth of Israel hoped that from it would radiate a universal and healing message. As is said in Isaiah, "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem . . . and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares." We did not expect to see an emporium for the arms traffic.

Words of Warning and Wisdom From A Saintly Member of the Friends

"Is it not ironic, 15 years after D-Day and after the role which Germany played in the coming of two world wars, that the U.S. should be rearming West Germany with information regarding atomic weapons. . . . These transfer agreements . . . practically close the door on any serious negotiations on 'denuclearization' or 'disengagement' in Europe. . . .

"We have recently been reminded by the hearings on nuclear war . . . of the tremendous choice before us . . . untold millions dead or abundant peace. . . . With stakes so great we should make ventures on the very best and deepest in our national life. We should not cower in fear in underground shelters waiting for the final blow. This is spiritual surrender. We can find no true security in military power which only breeds an opposing force. . . .

"The motto on our coins says, 'In God We Trust'. Do we have the faith as a nation to abandon our present faith in military strength, to adopt a policy of outgoing goodwill toward all countries including the Soviet Union and the people's Republic of China . . . to seek a series of regular conferences aimed at negotiating outstanding differences, and to see as our overriding common goal a disarmed world where the judicial process settles disputes? . . .

"Perhaps we need some of the faith of George Washington who, speaking at the Constitutional Convention of 1789, said: 'Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. . . .' Certainly there are risks, but does our present course, which may bring 48 million dead in a 'limited' attack, involve no risk? . . .

"Our nation today is at the pinnacle of its power. If it exerted that power in this kind of moral leadership, the course of history on this planet could be materially altered."

—Clarence E. Pickett, executive secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee, testifying July 2 against nuclear arms agreements with 7 NATO nations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scientist Spells Out the Dangers in the Shift from Conventional Arms

Even the Smallest Nuclear Weapons Pack A Fiery Poisonous Super-Punch

By Dr. Wm. C. Davidon

We present here slightly abridged the testimony July 2 by Dr. William C. Davidon on behalf of the Federation of American Scientists before the Pastore subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy against the pending nuclear arms agreements with seven NATO countries. Dr. Davidon, an Associate Physicist at the Argonne National Laboratory, is Chairman of the Chicago Chapter of the Federation. His testimony was based on a study of the "Nth Country Problem" made by a subcommittee (of which he was chairman) of a Committee on Technical Problems of Arms Limitation of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. This study will soon be published by the Committee on Security Through Arms Control of the National Planning Association of which he is also a member.

1. Is there a sharp distinction between conventional and small nuclear weapons?

In 1958, W. Libby referred to the 1.7 kiloton Rainier shot as among the smallest of nuclear explosions, yet this is nearly three times greater than the total of all explosives dropped by Germans in the biggest raid on London in World War II, in which .59 kilotons were dropped (on May 10, 1941).

A second major distinction is in the gross differences in the temperatures reached in the explosion. The military significance of this difference is that at the high temperatures of a nuclear explosion, a substantial fraction of the energy radiates away as heat and light, producing large-scale incendiary effects, while in a conventional explosion, this radiated heat and light is negligible. The incendiary effects alone from the Hiroshima explosion are reported to have exceeded that which would have been produced by 1,000 tons of carefully dispersed chemical incendiary bombs.

A third major distinction between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons is in the radioactive poisoning which the former alone produce. In low-yield nuclear explosions, when the amount of fission products is reduced, the unused fissionable material itself can be one of the most deadly poisons known, Plutonium. Hence, to produce the effects of one small nuclear weapon with World War II techniques would take a massive raid with conventional explosives, a heavy fire raid and the use of 'poison gas.'

2. What effect will the proposed agreements have on the more widespread reliance upon nuclear weapons by additional countries?

From considerations of manpower and cost, countries which we aid with nuclear weapons systems will be under considerable pressure to reduce their emphasis on conventional forces. Then their motivation for acquiring nuclear warheads under their own control will be intensified. Their motivation for independent manufacture is further increased by the provisions of the amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of July 3, 1958 which permits transfer of nuclear weapons and components to countries which have made substantial progress in nuclear weapons development. In addition, other countries, whether neutral, communist or capitalist, will in turn be subject to pressure to acquire nuclear weapons.

3. What are the capabilities of the NATO countries independently to manufacture nuclear weapons to use with the weapons systems we would be providing?

Our study of the "Nth Country Problem" concluded that France, Canada and West Germany could independently manufacture nuclear weapons in the immediate future. Canada has a long experience with nuclear technology. France has been operating reactors producing weapons-grade plutonium for a considerable time. West Germany has an active reactor construction program under way. In addition to several low power reactors, the U. S. has a bilateral agreement with West Germany to supply a 58 megawatt power reactor. A reactor of this type would be capable of making enough plutonium for a Hiroshima size atomic bomb in less than a year. Though controls are incorporated in the bilateral agreement between the U. S. and Germany to prevent the utilization of this plutonium in weapons, a growing reliance on nuclear weapons by the German military might have serious future consequences.

4. What capabilities do Communist countries have for independent manufacture of nuclear weapons?

The Joint Institute of Nuclear Research includes Albania, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Mongolia, North Korea, Poland, Rumania, the USSR and Vietnam. Nuclear reactors are built or currently planned in Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland and Rumania with assistance from the USSR.

Of these countries the only one which is reportedly developing nuclear weapons is Communist China. The status of China's nuclear weapons program may be further along than is generally realized, and it may well be that the world may soon be in for a shock comparable to the Soviet Sputnik should China test an A-bomb. China's first reactor is reported to have started operation in July 1957. It has also been reported from Warsaw (NYT 8/18/58) that the Soviet Union has an agreement with China to provide nuclear weapons assistance.

5. What effects on our future security, on eventual disarmament, and on political settlements would result from independent possession of nuclear weapons by many countries?

Few people regard the "balance of terror" as a long range solution. Even if it were completely effective in eliminating the possibility of rationally planned all-out attack, the danger remains that accidental, catalytic wars, or the spread of a local conflict will bring world disaster. With more individuals capable of initiating nuclear war, the danger of accidental war increases. Furthermore, the polarization of the world between two great powers now existing may tend to splinter into additional power groups, and leaders of a Germany or China might believe that catalyzing a war between the US and the USSR would be to their advantage.

If we believe that our civilization must not be interrupted, then progress towards disarmament is essential. Yet the failure to make such progress and the growing world-wide reliance on nuclear weapons each contributes to the other. The absence of progress towards disarmament drives men to the belief that security can be achieved only by their having control of more destructive weapons and the acquisition of these weapons by more powers makes progress toward disarmament more difficult. As a result the world situation is spiralling downward. It is for these reasons that we oppose the proposed agreements.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Most Liberal Congressmen Staunch on India and Firm on Missile Money

The House of Representatives Just Doesn't Like the Bill of Rights

A mob-like hostility to the Bill of Rights and to Supreme Court decisions upholding it has long been evident in the House of Representatives. Two recent test votes show some ebb in the repressionist tide but intolerance still commands ample majorities. The bill to reverse the Mallory decision and weaken the bars against police third degree methods passed the House last Tuesday 262-138. This was a slight improvement over the vote of 294-79 with which it passed last year, only to die in the Senate.

Not much comfort can be drawn from the vote with which the House on June 24 passed HR 3, the bill which has its emotional roots in animosity against the Nelson decision. The vote was 225-192 as compared with 241-151 the year before. This bill is a blunderbuss measure which threatens to disrupt 150 years of careful adjudication in many tangled problems of Federal-State relations.

Walter Quotes Sokolsky on Frankfurter

Even Congressman Walter appealed to the House not to pass the bill. He read into the record a column by George Sokolsky in praise of Justice Frankfurter and the new right wing majority on the Supreme Court. Walter assured the House that Justice Clark's ruling for this new majority in the Uphaus case cleared the way for state sedition prosecutions despite the Steve Nelson decision. The mob spirit could not be stemmed.

Walter himself mobilized this spirit last Monday when in double-quick time, under suspension of the rules, without a voice vote, the House passed his bill HR 2807, seriously restricting the right of appeal by aliens in deportation and exclusion cases. The House ignored a minority report against the bill by Celler and Libonati, and protests by the American Civil Liberties Union and by Monsignor Wycislo, acting chairman of a Committee on Refugee Problems which speaks for the Friends, the Lutherans, the National Catholic Welfare Council and HIAS. A similar bill passed the House last year and died in the Senate.

Southern hostility to the Court and the familiar tendency of most House liberals to look the other way when basic constitutional rights are at stake played their part in Walter's victory. Two grim if subtle jokes are hidden in the complex issues. Walter is furious because the Supreme Court extended to aliens some of the elaborate protections for property rights Walter erected against the New Deal in the pre-war Walter-Logan bill (the Administrative Procedures Act). One of the decisions which did this was written by Justice Tom Clark, the darling of the right. (Seems like you just can't trust Judges.)

The ACLU pleaded that "Fair treatment of persons involved with the Government—citizen or alien—is one concept that each day provides a showcase for the democratic ideal." Walter—as in his attitude toward the arts, which so resembles the "socialist realism" favored by the Babbitts who run the Soviet bureaucracy—insists on putting un-American monstrosities in that showcase. The bill reflects his xenophobia.

All this is well known to the liberals in the House—but most of them prefer to be liberal at a safe distance, on India, or on more money for missiles. Little warning bells ring and their blood chills when certain words are uttered. Label the measure a bill against "aliens" and "Reds" (as Walter did this one) and you could get the House to suspend the rules and repeal the Ten Commandments.

Un-American From Way Back

We expect Congress to stand fast against the campaign to erect a national memorial to Madison, "the Father of the Constitution," a document which has made it so difficult to deal expeditiously with subversives. Up-standing Americans rarely refer to the Constitution but "commies" (as is well known) may be spotted by their tendency to quote from it and from Madison's resolution against the Alien and Sedition Laws. No memorial should be authorized without a full field investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee. If its investigators look into the works of the late Charles Beard, himself a D.A.R. suspect in his time, they will find evidence that Madison even shared Marx's views on class conflict. Madison should have been subpoenaed long ago.

Make Friends and Influence People By Giving Them A Gift Subscription Using the Blank Below

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

7/13/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No. ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED